

To: Huitric, Michele[Huitric.Michele@epa.gov]; Zito, Kelly[ZITO.KELLY@EPA.GOV]
Cc: Calvino, Maria Soledad[Calvino.Maria@epa.gov]
From: Glenn, William
Sent: Fri 9/14/2018 8:20:08 PM
Subject: RE: FOR REVIEW - Media query - Chronicle - parcel A

Thanks, all!

Bill Glenn
Acting Deputy Director
Office of Public Affairs
U.S. EPA, Pacific Southwest
glenn.william@epa.gov / (415) 947-4254

From: Huitric, Michele
Sent: Friday, September 14, 2018 1:18 PM
To: Zito, Kelly <ZITO.KELLY@EPA.GOV>
Cc: Glenn, William <Glenn.William@epa.gov>; Calvino, Maria Soledad <Calvino.Maria@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: FOR REVIEW - Media query - Chronicle - parcel A

Great – thanks, Kelly! will send along.

From: Zito, Kelly
Sent: Friday, September 14, 2018 1:17 PM
To: Huitric, Michele <Huitric.Michele@epa.gov>
Cc: Glenn, William <Glenn.William@epa.gov>; Calvino, Maria Soledad <Calvino.Maria@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: FOR REVIEW - Media query - Chronicle - parcel A

This looks good to me-
Kelly

Sent from my iPhone
On Sep 14, 2018, at 1:14 PM, Huitric, Michele <Huitric.Michele@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi Bill –

After I referred them to CDPH and Navy for details on the radiation measurement, the reporters asked for explanation of why. SFD (up through John Chesnutt) approved this response. Good to go?

Question -- Michele, EPA's statement to us last night said that EPA "oversaw" the removal of this object. EPA clearly had a lead role here. Can you explain why you are sending us to other agencies and can't provide the information?

Response -- EPA was onsite for the removal of the deck marker and oversaw the process. EPA did not take direct radiation measurements of the object; that was handled by the Navy and CDPH.

Thanks,
Michele

From: Jason Fagone [<mailto:jfagone@gmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, September 14, 2018 11:36 AM
To: Huitric, Michele <Huitric.Michele@epa.gov>
Cc: Dizikes, Cynthia <CDizikes@sfchronicle.com>; Calvino, Maria Soledad <Calvino.Maria@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Parcel A find

Michele, EPA's statement to us last night said that EPA "oversaw" the removal of this object. EPA clearly had a lead role here. Can you explain why you are sending us to other agencies and can't provide the information?

ED_002217A_00000151-00001

On Fri, Sep 14, 2018 at 11:28 AM Huitric, Michele <Huitric.Michele@epa.gov> wrote:
Hi Cynthia –

Please contact the Navy and CDPH for that information. Here are some contacts for you:

Navy – Bill Franklin, William.d.franklin@navy.mil, 619-524-5433
CDPH – Dale Schornack, Dale.Schornack@cdph.ca.gov, (916) 558-1738

Thanks,
Michele

From: Dizikes, Cynthia [<mailto:CDizikes@sfchronicle.com>]

Sent: Friday, September 14, 2018 10:18 AM

To: Huitric, Michele <Huitric.Michele@epa.gov>

Cc: Jason Fagone <jfagone@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Parcel A find

Close of business today, thanks again

From: "Huitric, Michele" <Huitric.Michele@epa.gov>

Date: Friday, September 14, 2018 at 10:17 AM

To: "Dizikes, Cynthia" <CDizikes@sfchronicle.com>

Cc: Jason Fagone <jfagone@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Parcel A find

Hi,
I'll check. Deadline?
Michele

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 14, 2018, at 10:16 AM, Dizikes, Cynthia <CDizikes@sfchronicle.com> wrote:

Hi Michele,

Quick follow up, can we get the actual counts per minute and dose rate in millirems/hr from the scan and from the object after it was dug up?

Thanks,

Cynthia and Jason

From: "Huitric, Michele" <Huitric.Michele@epa.gov>

Date: Thursday, September 13, 2018 at 8:42 PM

To: "Dizikes, Cynthia" <CDizikes@sfchronicle.com>

Cc: Jason Fagone <jfagone@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Parcel A find

Please see below. Thanks!

The Navy is the lead agency on the cleanup at the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard Superfund site and the California Department of Public Health is the lead agency for radiation scanning on Parcel A at The

Shipyards development. EPA, along with its state regulatory agency partners, oversees and enforces Navy compliance with the Superfund law and other requirements to ensure the cleanup process – including Parcel A scanning – protects human health and the environment.

During the Parcel A scanning process, CDPH discovered one Navy-related object, a deck marker (1.5 inches in diameter), that contains radiological material. EPA oversaw the immediate removal of the object. Due to its location and level of radiation, the object was not causing harm to residents or workers. The cleanup process for HPNS requires Navy-related radiological material be cleaned up upon discovery (as opposed to other types of radiological material, such as naturally occurring radiation in granite).

EPA is working with the Navy to determine if and how the site cleanup needs to be adjusted. EPA supports completing scanning at Parcel A on a faster timeline than originally planned and making the scanning process more thorough at the Hunters Point site.

EPA remains committed to ensuring that the Bayview-Hunters Point community is protected from exposure to radiation and that the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard Superfund site can be safely used for work, recreation, and residential purposes.

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 13, 2018, at 7:37 PM, Dizikes, Cynthia <CDizikes@sfchronicle.com> wrote:

Story is already up, but still writing. Would need something within the hour.

From: "Huitric, Michele" <Huitric.Michele@epa.gov>

Date: Thursday, September 13, 2018 at 7:36 PM

To: "Dizikes, Cynthia" <CDizikes@sfchronicle.com>

Cc: Jason Fagone <jfagone@gmail.com>

Subject: RE: Parcel A find

Ok, let me check. When would you need something by?

From: Dizikes, Cynthia [mailto:CDizikes@sfchronicle.com]

Sent: Thursday, September 13, 2018 5:45 PM

To: Huitric, Michele <Huitric.Michele@epa.gov>

Cc: Jason Fagone <jfagone@gmail.com>

Subject: Parcel A find

Hi Michele,

Apologies for the late email, but we have just jumped on a breaking shipyard-related story about the discovery of a radium deck marker in the Parcel A rescanning. Hoping to get a comment from you in light of previous assurances the agency has made about the this part of the shipyard being free of contamination.

In light of this find, does the agency think that Parcel A should be re-checked more thoroughly? If not, why not? Should residents be concerned that this object was nearby and never flagged before? If not, why not?

We are on deadline, this story is scheduled to run in the paper tomorrow.

Thanks,

Cynthia and Jason